

V. REMARKS

Entry of the Amendment is proper under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 because the Amendment: a) places the application in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed herein; b) does not raise any new issue requiring further search and/or consideration because the Amendment amplifies issues previously discussed throughout prosecution; c) does not present any additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims; and d) places the application in better form for appeal, should an Appeal be necessary. The Amendment is necessary and was not earlier presented because it is made in response to arguments raised in the final rejection. The amendments to the subject claims do not incorporate any new subject matter into the claims. Thus, entry of the Amendment is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-5 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as unpatentable over Koyama et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,556,469) in view of Nishikawa et al. (U.S. Patent No. 3,804,055) and Mendelovich et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,904,806). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Koyama et al. is directed to a coating film transfer tool that includes an operating device, a tape paid-out device, a tape pressing device and a tape collecting device. The operating device is configured and dimensioned for allowing handheld operation by one hand. The tape paid-out device is provided in the operating device for paying out a coating film transfer tape for supply. The tape pressing device projects from a front end of the operating device for pressing the coating film transfer tape supplied by the tape paidout device against a transfer area. The tape collecting device is provided in the operating device for collecting the coating film transfer tape guided through a pressing part in a front end of the tape pressing device after it is used. The front end pressing part of the tape pressing device is adjustable in angle about its axial center.

Nishikawa. teaches a floor-type gearshift lever position indicator for a motor vehicle. The Examiner applies this reference to show a lever for moving particular elements contained within a device and is used to indicate the position of those particular elements.

Mendelovich et al. teaches a tape dispensing applicator and a replaceable tape cartridge. The cartridge supports a role of tape and a leading edge of the tape extends outwardly from the case. A partial cylindrical cover member is connected to the first end of a shell for pivotable movement thereabout along a predetermined path to cover a first passageway. A slider having a first end which is pivotally connected to the cover member and has a button which extends through a first slot in the shell is movable between a first position and a second position. In the first position, the cover member covers the first passageway. In the second position, the cover member is removed from the first passageway.

It is respectfully submitted that none of the applied art, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests the elements of claim 1 as now amended. Specifically, it is respectfully submitted that none of the applied art teaches or suggests a rotating operation unit for action includes an operation lever integrally formed with the head main body, and the operation lever serves also as a head position indicating unit for indicating the tape pressing and transferring position of the head main body.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to combine the features of the applied art because such combination would not result in the claimed invention. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is allowable over the applied art.

Claims 2-5 and 8 depend from claim 1 and include all of the features of claim 1. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the dependent claims are allowable at least for the reason claim 1 is allowable as well as for the features they recite.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Koyama et al., Nishikawa and Mendelovich as applied to claim 1 and further in view of Blau (DE 43 24 383). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As indicated above, claim 1 is allowable over Koyama, Nishikawa and Mendelovich. Blau fails to cure the deficiencies of Koyama, Nishikawa and Mendelovich and therefore claim 1 is allowable over the combination of the applied art.

Claim 6 depends from claim 1 and includes all of the features of claim 1. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the dependent claim is allowable at least for the reason claim 1 is allowable as well as for the features it recites.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as unpatentable over Koyama et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,556,469) in view of Nishikawa et al. (U.S. Patent No. 3,804,055) and Mendelovich et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,904,806). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is respectfully submitted that none of the applied art, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests the elements of claim 11 as now amended. Specifically, none of the applied art teaches or suggests a rotating operation unit for operating the head main body in the rotating direction includes an operation lever integrally formed with the head main body and the operation lever serves also as a head position indicating unit for indicating the tape pressing and transforming position of the head main body.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to combine the features of the applied art because such combination would not result in the claimed invention. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claim 11 is allowable over the applied art.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as unpatentable over Koyama et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,556,469) in view of Nishikawa et al. (U.S. Patent No. 3,804,055) and Mendelovich et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,904,806). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is respectfully submitted that none of the applied art, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests the elements of claim 12 as now amended. Specifically, none of the applied art teaches or suggests a rotating operation unit for operating the head main body in the rotating direction includes an operation lever integrally formed with the head main body, and the operation lever serves also as a head position indicating unit for indicating the tape pressing and transferring position of the head main body.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to combine the features of the applied art because such

combination would not result in the claimed invention. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claim 12 is allowable over the applied art.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.


In view of the foregoing, reconsideration of the application and allowance of the pending claims are respectfully requested. Should the Examiner believe anything further is desirable in order to place the application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below.

Should additional fees be necessary in connection with the filing of this paper or if a Petition for Extension of Time is required for timely acceptance of the same, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 18-0013 for any such fees and Applicant(s) hereby petition for such extension of time.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 25, 2004

By:


David T. Nikaido
Reg. No. 22,663

Carl Schaukowitch
Reg. No. 29,211

RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC
1233 20th Street, N.W. Suite 501
Washington, D.C. 20036
Tel: (202) 955-3750
Fax: (202) 955-3751
Customer No. 23353

Enclosure(s): Petition for Extension of Time (three months)
 Notice of Appeal

DC148552.DOC